



TITLE:

Two Notes on Dharmapāla and Dharmakīrti

AUTHOR(S):

FUNAYAMA, Toru

CITATION:

FUNAYAMA, Toru. Two Notes on Dharmapāla and Dharmakīrti. ZINBUN 2001, 35: 1-11

ISSUE DATE:

2001-03

URL:

<https://doi.org/10.14989/48788>

RIGHT:

© Copyright March 2001, Institute for Research in Humanities Kyoto University.

Two Notes on Dharmapāla and Dharmakīrti*

FUNAYAMA Tōru

§ 1. Was Dharmakīrti really mentioned by Dharmapāla?

“It is clear that if Dharmakīrti’s dating will be changed, a considerable number of related datings will have to be modified as well.”¹

“We seem to have several pieces of evidence of uncertain weight for an earlier dating—e.g., the possible mention of Dharmakīrti in Dharmapāla’s commentary on the *Ālambanaparīkṣā* and . . . if, for example, we had the Sanskrit of Dharmapāla’s commentary, the question as to whether Dharmapāla had mentioned Dharmakīrti might be resolved in two minutes.”²

The date of Dharmakīrti has been regarded as c. 600–660 C. E. since Erich FRAUWALLNER’s “Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic.”³ Against this, KIMURA Toshihiko recently proposed the date c. 550–620 C. E.⁴ Especially he insists that the name Dharmakīrti is mentioned by Dharmapāla, who is

* I would like to thank Prof. Leonard van der Kuijp (Harvard University), Prof. Ernst Steinkellner (University of Vienna) and Dr. Helmut Krasser (Austrian Academy of Sciences) for their invaluable comments on (an earlier draft of) this article. I am also grateful for Ms. Sara McClintock who kindly read through an earlier draft and improved my English.

¹ Eli FRANCO, Buddhist studies in Germany and Austria 1971–1996, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 22/2, 1999: 451 n. 194.

² Tom J. F. TILLEMANS, *Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇavārttika: An Annotated Translation of the Fourth Chapter (parārthānumāna) Volume 1 (k. 1–148)*, Wien, 2000: xiv–xv.

³ Erich FRAUWALLNER, Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 5, 1961: 137–139.

⁴ KIMURA Toshihiko 木村俊彦, A new chronology of Dharmakīrti, in KATSURA Shōryū (ed.), *Dharmakīrti’s Thought and Its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy: Proceedings of the Third International Dharmakīrti Conference. Hiroshima, November 4–6, 1997*, Wien, 1999: 209–214. Id., *Dharmakīrti ni okeru tetsugaku to shūkyō* ダルマキールティにおける哲学と宗教, Tokyo, 1998: 32–45. Since 1992, KIMURA has published several articles on dating Dharmakīrti.

—according to KIMURA— a younger contemporary of Dharmakīrti, in the *Guan suoyuan lun shi* 觀所緣論釋 (Dharmapāla’s commentary on the *Ālambanaparīkṣā*, translated into Chinese by Yijing 義淨; 635–713).⁵ KIMURA takes two Chinese graphs in the text, ‘*fa-cheng*’, to be ‘Dharma-kīrti’ (see below). However, while ‘*fa*’ 法 is no doubt the translation of *dharma*, ‘*cheng*’ 稱 could correspond to various Sanskrit terms,⁶ so that the interpretation of the original Sanskrit word needs a careful examination.

KIMURA is in fact not the only person to assume Dharmapāla’s reference to Dharmakīrti. KANAKURA Enshō had the same idea.⁷ SHEN Jianying also made two brief notes to the same effect.⁸ Unfortunately, however, neither KANAKURA nor SHEN explicitly explained how they actually understood the passage in question. KIMURA is the only person that presented this claim together with a translation.

As regards the *Guan suoyuan lun shi*, the quality of this incomplete translation work is far from good.⁹ It contains unclear passages throughout the work and in many cases it is very difficult to assume the original Sanskrit expression. It

⁵ The *Guan suoyuan lun shi* is an incomplete work. The translation was made in 710 C. E. according to the *Kaiyuan shijiaolu* 開元釋教錄 (T55, 567c).

⁶ Chinese graph *cheng* 稱 has various meanings: e.g., to declare, to call; to state; to weigh, to estimate; to raise, to proceed; to praise; and be suitable. Hence, when used as translation of a Sanskrit word, *cheng* corresponds to various words such as *yaśas*, *kīrti*, *jñāpaka*, *upādāna*, *prokta*, *ākhyā*, *tulanā*, as well as others.

⁷ KANAKURA Enshō 金倉圓照, *Indo sheishin bunka no kenkyū* 印度精神文化の研究, Tokyo, 1944: 357.

⁸ SHEN Jianying 沈劍英, *Yinmingxue yanjiu* 因明學研究, Shanghai, 1985: 15 n. 2 and 22 n. 1. Without referring to concrete passages, SHEN states that Yijing mentions Dharmakīrti in his composition, *Neifa zhuan* and in his translation, *Guan suoyuan lun shi*. Further, SHEN writes, “Dharmapāla (about in the sixth century) who was yet another leading disciple of Dignāga” (*op. cit.*: 14), on the one hand, and “Dharmakīrti who was a contemporary of Yijing” (*op. cit.*: 15) and “Dharmakīrti was probably after Xuanzang, and cannot have been the eminent disciple of Dharmapāla and Īśvarasena” (*op. cit.*: 15 n. 1), on the other. However, he does not explain why Dharmakīrti who prospered in the period between Xuanzang and Yijing can be mentioned in the text composed by Dharmapāla who prospered in the sixth century. Strangely, SHEN is not aware of such a chronological contradiction.

⁹ The translation of the *Guan suoyuan lun shi* was finished at the same time with the translation of the *Cheng weishi baosheng lun* 成唯識寶生論 (T No. 1591), Dharmapāla’s commentary on the *Vimśatikā*. The style of both translations is just the same, and the problems lying in the latter translation are variously pointed out by UI Hakuju 宇井伯壽 in his *Daijō butten no kenkyū* 大乘佛典の研究, Tokyo, 1963: 611–616.

should be noted here that when Lǚ Cheng and YINCANG¹⁰ edited the text, they had to insert a large number of words into Yijing's original translation in order to show their interpretation (see, e.g., the passage cited below). UI Hakuju's Japanese renderings¹¹ in the traditional *kundoku*-style are based on their edition.

Now let's go into the passage in question. As *pūrvapakṣa*, the following two ideas are presupposed at the beginning of the *Ālambanaparīkṣāvṛtti*: (A) "External atoms (*paramāṇavaḥ*) are the object (*ālambana*) of visual cognition, etc., because they are its cause (**tatkāraṇatvāt*)"; and (B) "The aggregate (**samūha*) of external atoms are the object of visual cognition, etc., because the cognition arises with such a manifestation."¹² In the midst of the commentary on these two views, especially with regard to the argument B, the passage in question appears as follows (underlining is mine):

1) Yijing's original translation (T31, 889c): "又若自許不於識外緣其實事。應有有法自相違過。然法稱不許。斯乃於他亦皆共許。卽以爲喻。"

2) Lǚ/YINCANG's interpretation¹³: "又若<分別因義>自許<所緣>不於識外緣其實事。<此因違彼宗中有法>。應有有法自相<相>違過。然<今>法<云所緣>稱不<共>許。斯乃於他亦皆共許<之所緣法>卽以爲喻。"¹⁴

3) KIMURA's English translation¹⁵: "If you assume that cognition is caused by an aggregate of atoms and not by atoms themselves,¹⁶ then you cannot assert the substance as the object of cognition. Then you could not help but committing the self-contradiction of your own standpoint. Thus Dharmakīrti does not approve your argument (然法稱不許) because it lacks an instance (*drṣṭānta*) for

¹⁰ Lǚ Cheng 呂澂 and Shi YINCANG 釋印滄 (eds.), *Guansuoyuanshilun huiyi 觀所緣釋論會譯*, *Neixue 內學* 4, 1928: 1-42 (=123-164).

¹¹ UI, *Jinna chosaku no kenkyū* 陳那著作の研究, Tokyo, 1958. Especially for the passage of our concern see p. 29 and p. 79f.

¹² *gañ dag mig la sogs pa'i rnam par śes pa'i dmigs pa phyi rol gyi don yin par 'dod pa de dag ni de'i rgyu yin pa'i phyir rdul phra rab dag yin pa 'am der snañ ba'i śes pa skye ba'i phyir de 'dus pa yin par rtog grañ na* //...; "Diejenigen, welche einen äußeren Gegenstand (*artha*) als Anhaltspunkt (*ālambana*) der Erkenntnis durch das Auge usw. (*cakṣurādivijñāna*) annehmen, glauben entweder, es seien Atome, weil diese ihre Ursache sind, oder eine Anhäufung derselben (*saṃhata*), weil die Erkenntnis, die entsteht, deren Bild trägt (*tadābhāsa*)."¹³ E. FRAUWALLNER, *Dignāgas Ālambanaparīkṣā. Text, Übersetzung und Erläuterungen*, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Morgenlandes* 37, 1930: 176 and 180.

¹³ Lǚ/YINCANG, *Guansuoyuanshilun huiyi*: 5.

¹⁴ Words in < > are the editors' insertions which present their interpretation. They are not found in Yijing's translation.

¹⁵ KIMURA, *A new chronology of Dharmakīrti*: 210.

¹⁶ The words such as 'atoms,' 'aggregate of atoms' are not found in Yijing's original translation.

sylogism.”¹⁷

4) AIYASWAMI SASTRI's Sanskrit translation¹⁸: “*na ca vijñānasya bahirdravyam pratyayaḥ / iti yadi sva[pa]kṣam] svīkaroṣi / [tadā] dharmināḥ svarūpavirodhadoṣaḥ syāt / tathā dharmavacanam aprasiddham*¹⁹ / *yad idaṃ paśasya sammatam tad eva drṣṭāntikriyate / . . .*”

5) AIYASWAMI SASTRI's English translation²⁰: “But if you assume that there is no external thing which may serve as a cause to consciousness; [then] there is a fault of the subject of your thesis being contradicted in its own character. So also is your *probandum* (*dharmā = sādhyadharmā*) unknown to us. If you say that what has been recognised by the opponent as an accepted fact, can only be formulated as an appropriate example, then . . .”

6) SCHOTT's German translation²¹: “Wenn wir nun meinen, daß man nicht außerhalb des Bewußtseins wirkliche Dinge zu Objekten hat, so gibt es notwendig den Fehler, daß der dharmin (*viśeṣya*) (nämlich: reales Objekt) in Gegensatz steht zu unserer (Lehre). Aber man darf nach der Logik (*fa*, 85 + 5)²² etwas nicht Zugegebenes doch erwähnen, das wird auch von den Gegnern zugegeben. Daher nehmen wir (die gegnerische Behauptung) als einen Ansatz.”

In the above translations, none of which are entirely satisfactory, no one except KIMURA considers ‘*fa-cheng*’ 法稱 to be a translation of Dharmakīrti. Provisionally, I suppose that the following interpretation of the passage is possible:

“And if those opponents themselves (who maintain argument B) admit that (visual cognition, etc.)²³ does not have an object as reality which exists outside of cognition, then the fallacy of the contradiction to the own nature of the minor term of the syllogism (*dharmin*)²⁴ will arise. Hence the mention of its property (*dharmā*; in the sense of *hetu* or logical reason) will not be admitted. Namely, that which is admitted (not only by his own party but) also by the other party (should be employed as) the example (*drṣṭānta*).”

¹⁷ For *ran-fa-cheng-bu-xu* 然法稱不許, KIMURA (*Dharmakīrti ni okeru tetsugaku to shūkyō*: 38) assumes the Sanskrit reconstruction *tathā ca necchati Dharmakīrtiḥ*.

¹⁸ N. AIYASWAMI SASTRI, *Ālambanaparīkṣā and Vṛtti by Dīnāga with the commentary of Dharmapāla*, The Adyar Library Series 32, 1942: 24.

¹⁹ *dharmināḥ... aprasiddham* is based on his emendation on *ibid.*, p. 62 n. 14, whereas his first translation (p. 24) before this emendation reads as follows: *dharminām svalakṣaṇavirodhaḥ syāt / tathā na dharmānuśaṁsanam prasidhyet*.

²⁰ *Ibid.*: 62.

²¹ Magdalene SCHOTT, *Sein als Bewußtsein. Ein Beitrag zur Mahāyāna-Philosophie*, Heidelberg, 1935: 31.

²² For the meaning of these symbols see *ibid.*: 4 “Abkürzungen und Zeichen.”

²³ Cf. LÜ/YINCANG takes *suo-yuan* 所緣, viz., *ālambana*, as the subject.

²⁴ I think that 有法自相違過 can be taken in the sense of 有法自體相違過 (cf. LÜ/YINCANG's interpretation: 有法自相相違過). The word 自體相違 is found in the same text T31, 891c.

As a whole, the text is very abstruse to me, and maybe my interpretation is also not without imperfection. Nevertheless, one point seems clear and certain: ‘*fa-cheng*’ is not ‘Dharmakīrti’ in this sentence. Even if I hypothetically follow KIMURA’s translation which deviates from the original Chinese in several points, I cannot really understand why Dharmapāla has to mention Dharmakīrti in this context.²⁵ Furthermore, generally speaking, it is rather embarrassing for me to accept that Dharmapāla refers to the name of his contemporaries in his writings. To my limited knowledge, I was unable to find any reference to contemporary thinkers such as to Dharmakīrti, etc., in Dharmapāla’s works, such as the commentary on the *Viṃśatikā* and the commentary on the *Catuhśataka*, when we set aside general references to Vaiśeṣika, Sāṃkhya, Kapila and the like.

It is indeed true that some technical terms which are remarkable in Dharmakīrti’s writings can be traced in Dharmapāla’s writings, too. For example, the reference to the example ‘*sara(s)*’ and ‘*rasa*’ in the context of demonstrating successive occurrences of auditory cognitions is common to Dharmapāla’s *Dacheng guang bailun shilun*²⁶ and Dharmakīrti’s *Pramāṇavārttika*.²⁷ Further, in the context of mental perception (*mānasapratyakṣa*; *manovijñāna*), Dharmakīrti points out an undesirable conclusion that even a blind person would come to cognize the external object, if one accepts that the mind-cognition cognizes what has not been cognized by sense perception.²⁸ The same argument is found in Dharmapāla’s works, too.²⁹ Also, the definition of self-awareness as

²⁵ If Dharmakīrti were mentioned here, it would be natural to use the expression such as “ācārya Dharmakīrti” or “bhadanta Dharmakīrti” (法稱論師/大德法稱) instead of just “Dharmakīrti,” though of course it is a minor issue in this case.

²⁶ *Dacheng guang bailun shilun* T30, 223b: 若聲細分同時而生。非前後立。如色細分。薩羅羅薩。如是等字。同時可聞。義應無別; tr. Tom J. F. TILLEMANS, *Materials for the Study of Āryadeva, Dharmapāla and Candrakīrti*, Wien, 1990, Vol. 1, 140f.: “If [however, it is argued that] the minute parts of words come into being simultaneously and do not exist as previous and subsequent states like the minute parts of form, then syllables such as *sa*, *ra*, (*saras* = “lake”) [and] *ra*, *sa* (*rasa* = “taste”) could be heard simultaneously [without any difference in their order], [and thus] the meanings [of *sara* and *rasa*] would have to be without any differences.”

²⁷ *Pramāṇavārttika* I 301: *ānupūrvyām asatyām syāt saro rasa iti śrutau / na kāryabheda iti ced asti sā puruṣāśrayā*; tr. TILLEMANS, *op. cit.*: 250 n. 230 “Suppose it is said that when there is no [objectively existing] order, then the words *saras* and *rasa* would not have any different effects. [Reply:] This [order] depends upon the person.”

²⁸ *Pramāṇavārttika* III 239cd: : *adrṣṭagrahaṇe ’ndhāder api syād arthadarsanam* // “If (the opponents assume that the mind-cognition [*manovijñāna*]) grasps what has not been directly perceived (by sense perception), it will follow that even the blind and the like (directly) cognize the object.”

sarvacittacaittānām ātmasamvedanam (*Nyāyabindu* I 10) looks just the same as the one in the *Fodi jing lun*,³⁰ translated³¹ by Xuanzang 玄奘 (d. 664).³² However, these examples are to be examined in connection with Dharmakīrti's formation of his own theory and expression. It is very difficult to take them to be the evidence for Dharmakīrti's chronological precedence to Dharmapāla or Xuanzang. Therefore, Dharmakīrti's date of activity should be reconsidered, if necessary, by using some other evidence.³³

²⁹ *Dacheng guang bailun shilun* T30, 226ab: 若智知境不由見生。盲聾等人應明了境。又不應有盲聾等人。以皆分明了色等故。 "If the cognition which cognizes an object arises independently of the direct experience [of the object through the sense organ], it will follow that (even) the blind and the like should vividly recognize (viz., perceive) the object. And [therefore], it will follow that the blind and the like do not exist, because they come to vividly recognize the form and so on." *Guan suoyuan lun shi* T31, 889b: 斯乃意識自能親緣外境體性。此則遂成無聾盲等。 "... then (it would follow that) the mind-cognition (*manovijñāna*) by itself is able to grasp the essence of the external object, and as its result, (it will follow that) the blind and the like do not exist." Note in passing that *mānasapratyakṣa* is not intended in these contexts.

³⁰ In the *Fodi jing lun* (commentary on the **Buddhabhūmi-sūtra*), the expression very similar to the *Nyāyabindu* I 10 is found in the form of a citation from the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. T 26, 303a: 集量論說。諸心心法。皆證自體。名為現量。 "It is stated in the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* that the mind and the mental elements are all (classified in) self-awareness and it is called direct perception." Such a passage does not appear in the *pratyakṣa*-chapter of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*.

³¹ It would be a task of further research to examine in what sense the *Fodi jing lun* was a translation, inasmuch as it introduces the view of *zheng zizhengfen* 證自證分 (**svasamvitti-samvitti-bhāga*; T26, 303c) which is not found elsewhere except in the *Cheng weishi lun* 成唯識論 by Dharmapāla (T31, 10b).

³² It is certain that Xuanzang went back to China in 645 C. E. and died in 664. As for the year of his birth, on the other hand, there are two slightly different views; viz., 600 and 602. See MIZUTANI Shinjō 水谷眞成, *Daitō saiiki ki* 大唐西域記, Tokyo, 1971: 438.

³³ As regards the relationship between Xuanzang and Dharmakīrti, Sh. KATSURA pointed out that Xuanzang, who was in Chang'an in 645, might have been partially informed of Dharmakīrti's logic. See KATSURA Shōryū 桂紹隆, Ronrigakuha 論理学派, in NAGAO *et al.* (eds.), *Iwanami kōza tōyō shisō daihakkān*. *Indobukkyō ichi* 岩波講座 東洋思想 第八卷 インド仏教 1, Tokyo, 1988: 342 n. 16. Cf. KATSURA Shōryū, On *trairūpya* formulae, in Kumoi Shōzen *hakase koki kinen*. *Bukkyō to Ishūkyō* 雲井昭善博士古稀記念 仏教と異宗教 (*Buddhism and Its Relation to Other Religions. Essays in Honour of Dr. Shōzen Kumoi on His Seventieth Birthday*), Kyoto, 1985: 163f. Note that this suggestion does not necessarily mean the chronological emendation. Of course we might be able to shift the date of Dharmakīrti a little earlier (e.g., 590–650), but the rejection of a previous study in such a form would not be so significant in the case of relative chronology.

§2. Reconsidering the year of Dharmapāla's death

Dharmapāla's life has been considered to be 530–561 C. E. since the articles of UI³⁴ and FRAUWALLNER.³⁵ The Chinese sources utilized by these scholars were the *Xiyu ji*, the *Cien zhuan*, the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, the *Shuyao* and the *Shuji*.

Xuanzang's period of stay in India as well as his life can be strictly fixed, if one neglects the difference of less than two years.³⁶ Xuanzang left the capital city of the Tang Dynasty, Chang'an, in the period between 627 and 629.³⁷ And a couple of years later,³⁸ he reached Nālandā Mahāvihāra, where he met Śīlabhadra (戒賢法師, 尸羅跋陀羅, 正法藏) for the first time. Śīlabhadra, who became Xuanzang's teacher at Nālandā, is recorded to have been 106 years old at that time.³⁹ Śīlabhadra was a student of Dharmapāla in his youth. These facts seemingly enable us to realize the detailed chronological calculations of their lives. Chinese sources also relate a few episodes regarding Śīlabhadra and Dharmapāla. Among them, I would like to call attention once again to two points:

- 1) "Dharmapāla was once challenged to a debate by a learned Brahmin from South India. He, however, assigned in his place Śīlabhadra, who won a brilliant victory over his opponent and with the rich reward given by the ruler founded a monastery. Śīlabhadra was at that time 30 years old."⁴⁰
- 2) "At the age of 29, he [=Dharmapāla] retired to the Bodhi-tree⁴¹ and spent the rest of his life in meditation and in the composition of several works. He died at the age of 32."⁴²

³⁴ UI, Genjō izen no Indo shoronshi no nendai 玄奘以前の印度諸論師の年代 (1928; in id., *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū* 印度哲學研究 Vol. 5, Tokyo, 1965): 128–132.

³⁵ FRAUWALLNER, Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic.

³⁶ See n. 32 above.

³⁷ Xuanzang's departure for India most probably took place in the first year of Zhenguan (627) or at the beginning of the second year of the same era (628). See KUWAYAMA Shōshin 桑山正進, How Xuanzang learned about Nālandā, in Antonino FORTE (ed.), *Tang China and Beyond. Studies on East Asia from the Seventh to the Tenth Century*. Italian School of East Asian Studies, Essays: volume 1: 29–33. KUWAYAMA Shōshin and HAKAMAYA Noriaki, *Genjō* 玄奘, Tokyo, 1981: 58–82 (written by KUWAYAMA).

³⁸ The year of Xuanzang's arrival at Nālandā Monastery is 634 according to UI, *op. cit.*: 121f. and 633 according to FRAUWALLNER, *op. cit.*: 133. On the other hand, YANG Tingfu (楊廷福, *Xuanzang nianpu* 玄奘年譜, Beijing, 1988: 160f.) takes it to be 631.

³⁹ Xuanzang's biography in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* T50, 451c. UI, *op. cit.*: 123f. FRAUWALLNER, *loc. cit.* As pointed by UI, the *Datang gu sanzang Xuanzang fashi xingzhuang*, another version of Xuanzang's biography, states that Śīlabhadra was 160 years old 一百六十歲 (T50, 216b).

⁴⁰ FRAUWALLNER, *loc. cit.*

Here, Point 1 is described in the *Xiyu ji* which was compiled by Bianji 辯機 on the basis of Xuanzang's information, while Point 2 is found in the *Shuyao* and the *Shuji*⁴³ which were composed by Kuiji 窺基 (or Ji 基)⁴⁴ as commentaries on the *Cheng weishi lun*. If we calculate the date of Dharmapāla by combining these two pieces of information, the conclusion would necessarily be the same as Frauwallner's idea: "If we suppose that Dharmapāla assigned Śīlabhadra to take his place in the debate because he had the intention of retiring under the Bodhi-tree, it follows that he was at that time in his 29th year, that is to say, one year younger than Śīlabhadra. Thus we can fix the date of his birth as 530 and of his death as 561 A. D."⁴⁵

However room for reconsideration still remains. First, although we cannot say that Śīlabhadra's old age of 106 is absolutely impossible, there is still room for doubt in an ordinary sense.⁴⁶ Second, the above-stated Point 2 about Dharmapāla's death at the age of 32 is found only in Kuiji's explanations and we cannot find its original source elsewhere, though it is naturally conjectured that such oral transmission stemmed from Kuiji's master, Xuanzang. And finally, Dharmapāla's short life-span does not fit very well with Point 2 in spite of UI/FRAUWALLNER's explanation. For, after the challenge of the Brahmin, the *Xiyu ji* describes how Śīlabhadra was assigned in place of Dharmapāla against the Brahmin's challenge in the following way:

. . . Śīlabhadra said, "As I have myself attended at various discussions, let me destroy this heretic." Dharmapāla, knowing his history, allowed him to have his

⁴¹ In the *Xiyu ji*, Dharmapāla's connection with the Bodhi-tree is mentioned also in an episode of the contact between Dharmapāla and Bhā[va]viveka (*Xiyu ji*: 844=T51, 930c-931a). However, Dharmapāla's age is not mentioned there.

⁴² FRAUWALLNER, *loc. cit.*

⁴³ *Shuyao* T43, 608ab: "At the age of twenty-nine (Dharmapāla) became aware of his own imminent passing away. He therefore practised meditation all the time and vowed to himself not to leave the Bodhi-tree, where he spent three years; and he made this commentary (on the *Trīṃśikā*, i.e., the *Cheng weishi lun*) in the spare time between meditation and religious service." *Shuji* T43, 231c: "Dharmapāla in Sanskrit, who is called Hufa (i.e., protecting dharma) in Tang China. This great master was the son of the king* of Kāñcīpura of Draviḍa in South India. . . . He died at the Mahābodhi Temple at the age of thirty-two." (*'king' should be 'minister' according to the *Xiyu ji*: 855=T51, 931c).

⁴⁴ Kuiji (632-682) was one of the most eminent disciples of Xuanzang. He did not have access to the reports of recent Indian Buddhism by Yijing (635-713), since the latter composed the *Neifa zhuan* in 691 and came back to Luoyang 洛陽 in 695, after Kuiji's death. For the biography of Yijing see WANG's note in the *Datang xiyu ji qiu fa gaoseng zhuan*: 253-267, and his introduction to the *Neifa zhuan*: 1-26.

TWO NOTES ON DHARMAPĀLA AND DHARMAKĪRTI

way. At this time Śīlabhadra was just thirty years old. The assembly, despising his youth, feared that it would be difficult for him alone to undertake the discussion. Dharmapāla knowing that the mind of his followers was disturbed, hastened to relieve them and said, “In honouring the conspicuous talent of a person we do not say, ‘He has cut his teeth’ (*count his years according to his teeth*). As I see the case before us now, I feel sure that he will defeat the heretic; he is strong enough.”⁴⁷

In this story, Śīlabhadra is described as ‘the most talented person among Dharmapāla’s students’ (門人戒賢者 . 後進之翹楚也).⁴⁸ According to UI/FRAUWALLNER’s reasoning, Dharmapāla is calculated to be only 29 years old, younger than Śīlabhadra by one year, who in this episode, was not taken seriously because of his youth! If this is a persuasive account⁴⁹ then common sense would lead us to believe that Dharmapāla must be much older than young Śīlabhadra in this anecdote.

In this regard, I would rather conjecture that there were two different,

⁴⁵ FRAUWALLNER, *loc. cit.* Cf. UI’s explanation regarding this point (*op. cit.*: 129f.): “. . . On the other hand, it is widely said that Dharmapāla was one year younger than Śīlabhadra. It is not certain in which text this is stated, nor is it clear whether this is really Xuanzang’s transmission. . . . From this description [i.e., the episode of Point 1], there is no reason to assume that Dharmapāla must have been 29 years old at that time, nor that he was younger than Śīlabhadra. Usually, one considers that Dharmapāla would possibly be older than Śīlabhadra. However, seen from the *Shuji* and the *Shuyao* [see n. 43 above], Dharmapāla must not have been older than 29. This would be the reason why previous studies take Dharmapāla to have been younger than Śīlabhadra by one year, through calculating their ages as being as close as possible. Between a master and his pupil, the master do not have to be older than his pupil. The assumption of the difference by several years between them would not be impossible if there is any reason; if not, the minimum difference should inevitably be assumed, therefore there will be no problem if one assumes the difference of age by one year. Hence Dharmapāla turns out to be an individual who lived from 530 to 561. . . .” Brackets are mine.

⁴⁶ According to the *Cien zhuan* (T50, 261b), in 653 Xuanzang was informed of Śīlabhadra’s death by a Chinese envoy who returned from India. UI (*op. cit.*: 127f.) conjectures that Śīlabhadra died in c. 645. If one assumes Śīlabhadra’s age to have been 106 in c. 634 when Xuanzang met him first, Śīlabhadra comes to have survived to be nearly 120 years old! Śīlabhadra’s age might therefore be reduced by twenty or thirty years. TILLEMANS (*Materials for* . . . , Vol. 1, 8 n. 21) also doubts Śīlabhadra’s age.

⁴⁷ Samuel BEAL, *Si-yu Ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World*. London, 1884 (Reprint Delhi 1981): Pt. 2, 111f. Underlines are mine. *Xiyu ji*: 661=T51, 914c

⁴⁸ BEAL’s translation *loc. cit.* “Śīlabhadra and the inferior disciples” is not correct.

⁴⁹ Needless to say, how much fact the episode contains is another question.

unrelated transmissions in China about Dharmapāla's career, though both of them might have originated from Xuanzang's mouth. Namely, Dharmapāla may have had a comparatively long life-span (just as is presupposed in some Tibetan traditions),⁵⁰ the idea implicitly presupposed in Point 1; and Dharmapāla, the young genius, who expired at the age of 32. I cannot help hesitating to combine these points to calculate Dharmapāla's life as UI/FRAUWALLNER did. It seems true that Dharmapāla was born in the South and later achieved brilliant success at Nālandā Mahāvihāra,⁵¹ and it was probably in the second half of the sixth century.⁵² However, I do not think that his exact period of life can be settled only from the above-mentioned Chinese sources.

Kuiji states that Dharmapāla had three successors (*menren* 門人): Viśeṣamitra, Jinaputra and Jñānacandra.⁵³ Of them, Viśeṣamitra and Jñānacandra are mentioned by Xuanzang in the *Xiyu ji*⁵⁴ as eminent monks of Nālandā Monastery. What is puzzling is Yijing's testimony. In the 34th chapter 'Learning Method in the West' of his *Neifa zhuan*,⁵⁵ Yijing refers to Jñānacandra in the following way: "In the West (i.e. India), at present, there are the master of the law Jñānacandra of Telāḍhaka⁵⁶ Monastery, Bhadanta Ratnasimha of Nālandā (Monastery), Divākaramitra in the East, Tathāgatagarbha in the South, and Śākyakīti in Śrīvijaya of the southern ocean." They are mentioned as the living masters whose instruction Yijing received personally (此諸法師。[義]淨並親狎筵机。洵受微言). Yijing decided to go back to China after his stay at Nālandā for ten years

⁵⁰ For example, Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism* (Chapter 25) states that Dharmapāla had preached at Nālandā for over thirty years.

⁵¹ Dharmapāla's connection with Nālandā is certain; what is called 'Cell of Bodhisattva Dharmapāla' 護法菩薩房 existed in the monastery at Xuanzang's time. *Cien zhuan* T50, 237a.

⁵² On trial, for example, if we hypothesize that Dharmapāla survived till sixty and was older than Śīlabhadra by twenty years and that the latter was not 108 but, say, 88 years old when Xuanzang met him first, then Dharmapāla's life would be c. 530–590.

⁵³ Viśeṣamitra 毘世沙蜜多羅, 勝友. Jinaputra 辰那弗多羅, 勝子. Jñānacandra 若那戰達羅, 智月. *Shuji* T43, 231c-232a.

⁵⁴ *Xiyu ji*: 757 = T51, 924a.

⁵⁵ *Neifa zhuan*: 207f. = T54, 229c.

⁵⁶ The name *Telāḍhaka* is ascertained by the evidence of two inscriptions. See the following studies: *Archaeological Survey of India. Vol. VIII*, Calcutta, 1878: vii-viii (by Alexander CUNNINGHAM) and p. 34f. (by J. D. BEGLAR); *Vol. XI*, Calcutta, 1880: 164–169 and Plate XLII (by Alexander CUNNINGHAM). Surendranath MAJUMDAR SASTRI, *Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India, Edited with Introduction and Notes*, Calcutta, 1924: 720 (MAJUMDAR SASTRI's note on *Ti-lo-shi-kia*). MIZUTANI, *op. cit.*: 254 n. 1.

TWO NOTES ON DHARMAPĀLA AND DHARMAKĪRTI

(675–685). Therefore, Jñānacandra was alive possibly until 685. Here, we have the problem of Jñānacandra's very long life-span just as in the case of Śīlabhadra. A possible solution would lie in the interpretation of 'successor' (*menren*). This expression signifies that they belonged to Dharmapāla's school, but it does not necessarily mean that they are the 'direct' successors. Jñānacandra might have been Xuanzang's contemporary, nearly of the same age.

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Cien zhuan | Datang da ciensi sanzangfashi zhuan |
| Neifa zhuan | Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan |
| Shuji | Chengweshilun shuji |
| Shuyao | Cheng weishi lun zhangzhong shuyao |
| T | Taishō shinshū daizōkyō 大正新脩大藏經 |
| Xiyu ji | Datang xiyu ji |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cheng weishi lun shuji 成唯識論述記 (Kuiji 窺基): T Vol. 43, No. 1830.
Cheng weishi lun zhangzhong shuyao 成唯識論掌中樞要 (Kuiji): T Vol. 43, No. 1831.
Dacheng guang bailun shilun 大乘廣百論釋論 (Dharmapāla; tr. Xuanzang: T Vol. 30, No. 1571.
Datang da Ciensi Sanzangfashi zhuan 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳 (Huili and Yancong 慧立本彥悰 箋): T Vol. 50, No. 2053.
Datang gu sanzang Xuanzang fashi xingzhuang 大唐故三藏玄奘法師行狀 (Mingxiang 冥詳): T Vol. 50, No. 2052.
Datang xiyu ji 大唐西域記 (Bianji 辯機): Datang xiyu ji jiaozhu 大唐西域記校注, edited by Ji Xianlin 季羨林. Beijing 1985. Cf. T Vol. 51, No. 2087.
Datang xiyu qiufa gaoseng zhuan 大唐西域求法高僧傳 (Yijing 義淨): *Datang xiyu qiufa gaoseng zhuan jiaozhu* 大唐西域求法高僧傳校注, edited by WANG Bangwei 王邦維. Beijing 1988.
Fodi jing lun 佛地經論 (Qinguang *et al.* 親光等; tr. Xuanzang 玄奘): T Vol. 26, No. 1530.
Guan suoyuan lun shi 觀所緣論釋 (Dharmapāla; tr. Yijing): T Vol. 31, No. 1625.
Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan 南海寄歸內法傳 (Yijing): *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan jiaozhu* 南海寄歸內法傳校注, edited by WANG Bangwei. Beijing 1995. Cf. T Vol. 54, No. 2125.
Xu gaoseng zhuan 續高僧傳 (Daoxuan 道宣): T50, No. 2060.